

Supply

that we would like to see the over-all budget significantly increased, but that is another question which we will discuss later. Today we are discussing the Estimates for the National Film Board for 1987-88. That is what we are doing. We are trying to send through this vote, which we will support, a clear message to the National Film Board, and presumably to responsible members of the Government and of the Official Opposition, that we would like to see a significant increase in moneys for women's production.

When I look at what was spent in 1985-86, with all due respect, and look at what the Government plans to spend this year in terms of production—and all I can go on is what is in the Estimates—I see a decrease. What is even more alarming is when I look at the French programming, it is not even mentioned. So if the Government plans to have some new initiatives, then for goodness sake this is the place it should be. In this way Members of Parliament could make an informed decision on whether or not we should support it. And when I look at the French Programming Financial Resource Allocation for 1987-88 and do not see it mentioned as a priority, then I have to be concerned and assume that it is not a priority. I cannot second-guess what someone somewhere might have as a priority if it is not in the Estimates. After all the Estimates estimate where the Government plans to spend money in certain areas. It is as simple as that.

I have listened to the interjections and I respect them. What I am saying is that I hope next year, in the best interest of all concerned, that when we look at the National Film Board we will see Studio D put aside in a special, separate section. In this way we would be able to see specifically what the funding was last year and what it will be this year and next year. I say that because there is obviously some confusion now. I will not make any suggestion as to where that confusion might originate. Nevertheless, it would be a significant way to improve the ability of Members of Parliament to follow through what the Government is actually expending in certain areas of this very important budget.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maily: I would like to have a division on this matter, Madam Speaker, for I cannot let the Hon. Member get away with that last comment. It is quite clear.

[*English*]

The Budget Summary is very much part of the Estimates. It was available to all Members of Parliament, including the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald). It is very clear. For instance, the Hon. Member mentioned French programming, something which we instituted in 1986. For the budget of 1986-87 it states very clearly \$159,000. For 1987-88 the figure is \$404,000. It has not decreased, it has increased. The same applies to Studio D. In 1986-87 the figure was \$579,880, which has been increased to \$795,450 for 1987-88.

• (1620)

I think what has happened is that there is some confusion about the total budget of the National Film Board. The budget for Studio D, the English counterpart of the women's program, is not the whole program for women. The whole program for women at the National Film Board was worth in 1986-87, \$1,174,000, and it will be receiving funding in 1987-88 of \$1,678,430. That is definitely up and not down.

I believe the confusion lies in the reading of those figures to which the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood referred. She came to a different conclusion, but this does not negate the fact that what has been suggested by the Hon. Member in this motion is to cut \$100,000 from the budget, one-fifth of the budget allocated to Studio D. That is a large cut.

Ms. McDonald: Madam Speaker, I would like to reply—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) would have the right to answer. Does he give the floor to the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)?

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I do not have much to say in response to that. I heard the Hon. Member's comments and I accept them. I expect we should get on with the debate.

Ms. McDonald: Madam Speaker, I simply want to respond very briefly. It has been stated many times by the Parliamentary Secretary that somehow my response is a personal one and that the head of the National Film Board has a different way of proceeding. She has said that I simply want to be autocratic about this. I wish to respond to the criticisms—

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maily: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Maily) on a point of order.

Mrs. Maily: Madam Speaker, I am somewhat confused. The Hon. Member for the New Democratic Party just said that he had nothing to add in answer to my question, which means that the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) is now commenting on my remarks instead of the remarks of the Hon. Member who just spoke. I suggest that the debate is over and we could now put the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): There was one minute left in the questions and comments period after the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) ended his remarks. I therefore allowed, and I think it is quite proper to do so, the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) to speak during that one minute before we resume debate.